

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

Claims 1-60 have been previously cancelled. Claims 61, 62, and 64 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy shown during the telephonic interview conducted on September 13, 2010. The rejections to the claims were discussed and potential claim amendments were discussed.

Response to the Office Action

In the Final Office Action mailed June 14, 2010, claims 61-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In the Advisory Action mailed September 24, 2010, the Examiner indicated that he would not enter the amendment of September 14, 2010. The Examiner indicated that claims were allowable over the prior art and that claims 61-64 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 61 has been amended to explicitly state that the intermediate conveyor is ground based. This amendment is made at the Examiner's suggestion. (see page 2 of the Office Action mailed June 14, 2010) It is believed that the amendment cures the Examiner's concerns with respect to claim 61.

Claim 62 has been amended to recite that at least one of the conveyor belts is length-modifiable. Support for this amendment may be found in paragraph [0037] (as numbered in the printed application). Further paragraphs [0027] and [0031] (as numbered in the printed application) describe various conveyors being length modifiable. The antecedent issue identified in the Action dated September 24, 2010 has also been addressed.

Claim 64 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. It is believed that the amendments to claims 61, 62 and 64 resolve the examiner's concerns with respect to these claims.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claim 61-64 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 77919.21900.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



P. Alan Larson
Registration No. 53,184

Date: **October 14, 2010**
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1500
Facsimile: 202-861-1783

103560461_1.DOC